

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14 were rejected in the Office Action. Claims 1-5, 7 and 11-13 have been amended, and claims 15-16 have been added, leaving claims 1-16 for the consideration upon entry of the present amendment.

Claim Objections:

Claim 5 was objected to for informalities.

Claim 5 has been amended to delete the claim limitations starting from line 20 of page 25 to line 18 of page 26, which is "The present invention includes, ..., objects", as suggested by the Examiner.

Thus, withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102:

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Amin et al., EP Pub. Number EP 0,788,287 (hereinafter "Amin") for the reasons stated on page 3 of the Office Action.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite, a method to prevent fraudulent use of a wireless unit roaming in a visited system, comprising: locking the wireless unit prior to a registration of the wireless unit; performing a first authentication process to unlock the wireless unit; in response to unlock of the wireless unit, carrying out the registration of the wireless unit in the visited system including validation of the wireless unit with a home system of the wireless unit; and performing, in response to the registration, a second authentication process implementing a denial of originating communication service to the wireless unit. Support for the amendment can be found on page 16, lines 2-9 of the specification.

The method of claim 11 performs a first authentication process prior to the registration of the wireless unit, and a second authentication process after unlock of the wireless unit and the registration of the wireless unit, thereby improving the process for preventing the fraudulent uses of the wireless unit.

On the contrary, Amin neither locks a subscriber prior to the registration of the subscriber nor performs the registration and authentication process in response to the unlock of the subscriber.

Thus, Amin does not disclose or teach the claim elements: locking the wireless unit prior to a registration of the wireless unit; performing a first authentication process to unlock the wireless unit; in response to unlock of the wireless unit, carrying out the registration of the wireless unit in the visited system including validation of the wireless unit with a home system of the wireless unit; and performing, in response to the registration, a second authentication process implementing a denial of originating communication service to the wireless unit, as claimed in claim 11.

Accordingly, Amin does not anticipate or render obvious claim 11. Claims 12-14 and new claims 15-16 depend from claim 11, thus include all the limitations of claim 11. It is thus believed that claims 12-16 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 11.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 1-2 and 5-6

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Amin for the reasons stated on pages 4-5 of the Office Action.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method to prevent fraudulent use of a wireless unit that is roaming in a visited system, comprising: in response to the receipt of the code, causing the MSC-V to transmit a message including the identification information to a verification element functionally connected to the visited system and a home system of the wireless unit; and based on the positive verification received in the response, causing the MSC-V to remove the denial of the originating communication service with respect to the wireless unit, thereby initiating the communication service with respect to the wireless unit. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, on page 12, lines 18-26 of the specification.

Claim 1 requests the verification information of the wireless unit to the verification element functionally connected to the visited system and the home system of the wireless unit. Thus, claim 1 obtains the verification information for the wireless unit quicker than a conventional method in which the validation of the wireless unit is requested to each home system of the wireless unit, the system checking a home location register (HLR) (See, pp. 4-5 of the Application).

On the contrary, Amin requests the verification of the subscriber to the HLR (66 in Fig. 1 of Amin) of a home network (120) (See, col. 6, ll. 34-47 and col. 8, ll. 23-29 of Amin), like the conventional method. Thus, Amin cannot achieve the effect of quicker verification, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Amin does not teach or suggest the element: in response to the receipt of the code, causing the MSC-V to transmit a message including the identification information to a verification element functionally connected to the visited system and a home system of the wireless unit, as claimed in claim 1.

The Examiner states that with the broadest reasonable interpretation and in light of the specification of Amin, the holding state or delaying state in Amin could be interpreted as a denial state as claimed because both of them are used to achieve the same subject matter and the same solution. However, this is a reliance on "obvious to try", and the Examiner cannot base a determination of obviousness on what the skilled person in the art might try or find obvious to try.

Claim 1 denies the origination of the communication service with respect to the wireless unit as a part of registration of the wireless unit, and removes the denial of the origination in response to the verification of the wireless unit, thereby initiates the communication service with respect to the wireless unit. On the contrary, Amin already originates a call before the registration denial, and determines whether a roaming area in question is restricted and, if it is, whether a subscriber is a frequent roamer. Thus, Amin performs the registration denial after the call is already originated. Accordingly, there is, in Amin, no teaching or suggesting of denying the origination and removing the denial.

Further, the denial of the origination, in claim 1, is performed before the verification of the wireless unit, while the registration denial (210 in Fig. 2), in Amin, is performed after the verification of the subscriber (210 in Fig. 2).

Accordingly, Amin does not teach or suggest the elements: as a part of registration of the wireless unit with a visited mobile switching center (MSC-V) of the visited system, causing the MSC-V to implement denial of originating communication service with respect to the wireless unit; after the registration of the wireless unit with the MSC-V and the denial of the originating communication service with respect to the wireless unit, receiving at the MSC-V a code and identification information from the

wireless unit; and based on the positive verification received in the response, causing the MSC-V to remove the denial of the originating communication service with respect to the wireless unit, whereby initiating the communication service with respect to the wireless unit, as claimed in claim 1.

Thus, Amin does not render obvious claim 1. Claims 2, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. It is thus believed that claims 2, 5 and 6 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claims 3-4 and 7-10

Claims 3-4 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin in view of Marchand et al., PCT Pub. Number WO 97/26769 (hereinafter "Marchand") for the reasons stated on pages 5-6 of the Office Action.

Marchand discloses obtaining subscriber pre-authorization to temporarily access a cellular telecommunications system through a roaming area. In Marchand, the authentication process is performed in a home area of the subscriber. Thus, Marchand does not teach or suggest the element: in response to the receipt of the code, causing the MSC-V to transmit a message including the identification information to a verification element functionally connected to the visited system and a home system of the wireless unit, as claimed in claim 1.

Further, Marchand simply discloses obtaining temporary roaming authorization and terminating the authorization at the home area or after a predetermined period of time has elapsed. Marchand, however, does not teach or suggest denying the origination of the communication service and removing the denial, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Marchand does not cure the deficiency of Amin. Accordingly, the combination of Marchand and Amin does not render obvious claim 1.

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1. It is thus believed that claims 3-4 are allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite a system to prevent fraudulent use of a wireless unit that is roaming in a visited system, comprising a visited mobile switching center (MSC-V), and the network element operative in response to receipt of the identification information to provide a verification in a feature request response to the MSC-V, the network element being functionally connected to the visited system and a

home system of the wireless unit. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, on page 12, lines 18-26 of the specification.

Claim 7 is believed to be patentable over Amin in view of Marchand for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claims 8-10 depend from claim 7, and claims 8-10 are believed to be allowable due to its dependency on claim 7.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: April 29, 2003